



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_CJAST_37249
Title of the Manuscript:	Development of an Improved Crucible Furnace using Locally Sourced Materials for Teaching and Learning Purposes in Metallurgical Laboratory
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	No After reviewing this paper carefully, I believe that this study is interesting and suitable for the journal. Therefore, I recommend that this article is acceptable to the journal after a minor revision.	The corrections have been made as directed
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	More completed literature reviews should be added to the paper.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	This paper studies the thermal conductivity, speed controller, digital thermos controller, melting of Al scraps of the crucible furnace. The results and methodologies are quite interesting and suitable for the journal. Therefore, I suggest that this paper is acceptable after the authors add more literature reviews on relevant previous studies to the manuscript.	I accepted all reviewers' results/comments with great thanks. All observations have been noted and taken care of.